



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

portions of his father's history with the judicial fairness and impartiality which so honorably distinguishes this work. Its author deserves the thanks of us all for a valuable contribution to the popular stock of historical knowledge, as well as to the biographical literature of the language.

This work, however, has one great deficiency. It has no *Index*, nor even a full table of contents. As this is to be a book of permanent interest, we trust that the author will have so essential a want supplied in future editions. We think that a law should be passed making the publication of an historical or biographical work without an Index a misdemeanor, punishable by fine and imprisonment. With which truculent but wholesome suggestion we take our leave of the subject.

3.—*The Study of Government*. By GEORGE H. YEAMAN. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 8vo. 1871.

AMERICAN political education consists in the study of the Federal Constitution and a cursory view of political economy. We cannot admit that history, as at present taught, conduces in the least to a correct appreciation of political methods. When history is taught philosophically, and not picturesquely, the question will assume a different shape; but at present, the libraries of schools and universities are not full of books which throw such clear light upon the events of the past that we can afford to accept them at once as a record and as an explanation. The value of the study of political economy cannot be overestimated; the value of the study of the American Constitution depends entirely upon the method of instruction. If it is taught in a broad and elementary manner,* the result cannot but be good; if it is taught from a legal point of view, the result cannot but be bad. Cultivation of a political rather than a legal turn of mind is what is wanted. Interpretation and application of the Constitution involves, not questions of politics, but questions of the construction of a written instrument according to rules which, in so far as they resemble those applicable to wills and contracts, are of no more interest to the student of politics than to the student of any other moral science, and in so far as they differ from those rules, can only interest him as presenting a puzzling array of incongruities and absurdities. For example, the division of the powers of government into judicial, legislative, and executive is to the constitutional lawyer a finality; to the philosophical student of poli-

* As, for instance, in Mr. Furman Sheppard's text-book.

tics it is nothing of the kind. Such a student would be early taught that the executive has judicial and legislative functions; the legislature, judicial and executive functions; the judiciary, executive and legislative functions: that each department in practice performs multitudes of acts which, by theoretical construction, would belong to the others. The student of the Constitution is too often sent out into the world impressed with the idea that of such distinctions as these no less can be said than that their seat is the bosom of God.

It is to be noticed, too, that what is at least one of the most valuable parts of political education is, for reasons into which it is not necessary to enter here, now almost entirely beyond the reach of the cultivated classes in America,—we mean that instruction which comes of practical acquaintance with political affairs through the exercise of political functions. Our readers will hardly hesitate to admit that those classes have every year less and less share in the administration of the government of the country. If they are ever to regain the control so lamentably lost, it will be through a careful study of the conditions of political life. If the reign of demagogues is ever to cease and intelligence to resume her sway, it will be through science, and not through that blind faith in the excellence of our institutions which a wicked jealousy of other nations induces us to mistake for patriotism. The case was very different at the time of the formation of the American government. Then the political classes were the intelligent classes, and it is not an immaterial fact that, if we examine the books produced in this country relating to political subjects, we find that the *Federalist* remains to the present day the best handbook of the political art for Americans. Written by men of the widest experience and the greatest practical sagacity, it is replete with wisdom staunch enough to stand the severest of all tests, that of time. Tocqueville's *Democracy* is robbed of half its value by the taint of abstract and metaphysical speculations which pervades it. An able writer has pointed out in the pages of this Review, that his work is so much occupied with deductions from the "principle of equality," that he continually fails to take into account the numerous other influences which are at work. The student should be taught to approach with great caution the writings of an author who considers it proper in a political treatise to undertake such extraordinary tasks as that of showing "what causes democratic nations to incline towards pantheism," and "how equality suggests to the Americans the idea of the indefinite perfectibility of man."

Since Tocqueville, no book of any moment has appeared in America, and not more than one or two in England, dealing with questions of politics in a broad manner. Such contributions to political science

as have made their way into print are to be found scattered through the pages of magazines and newspapers. The quality of most of them induces the hope that they may never be preserved in a more permanent form. For a long time we have been content to find the staple of our political literature in glib declarations of natural rights and the meaningless resolutions of party caucuses. For more than a generation the true methods of political observation and study have been falling into greater and greater contempt, until it is no exaggeration to say that crazy speculation passes for genuine knowledge, and the dreams of fools are taken for the revelations of angels.

Statements so general as these cannot be demonstrated mathematically, but we can easily show by one or two illustrations what we mean when we speak of the decay of the political art.

Among the many political aphorisms which wisdom and experience have at various times given to the world, none is truer nor more universally admitted by those who have given the matter any attention than the saying of Burke, that no government can rest upon the heroic virtues. He might have added, that government is instituted for the purpose of dispensing with the necessity for the heroic virtues. It is not government, but anarchy, which sustains its life upon them. Revolutions are sustained by that very heroism which in ordinary times furnishes society insufficient support. To overturn a government requires enthusiasts, — in other words, heroes, — men who are capable of sacrificing to an ideal good the substantial advantages of life; men to whom self is nothing, to whom wife, children, the ordinary ambitions and prizes of the world, are forgotten things. Animated by such self-forgetfulness, not merely individuals, but whole armies of martyrs, have nobly endured torture and death. But virtue like this is not seen in activity except at rare intervals, while an orderly government must rest on perennial, not occasional, qualities. The only motives upon which an orderly government can count are the motives furnished by such modest desires as the love of property, the love of law, the love of wife, family, and reputation. Any system which needs for its support the higher and rarer motives of action will be sure to fail. This is but a corollary of the ancient rule, that government must deal with human beings as it finds them. It does not find many of them heroes.

But, obvious as all this may seem, it is hardly going too far to say that one would most naturally infer, from the tenor of our political literature, that it was not only far from clear, but that it was wholly untrue, so persistently do those engaged in the work of political education ignore it. That clerical exhortations should abound in appeals to the virtues of heroism is right enough, since churches are rather established

for the purpose of teaching *la haute morale* than *la haute politique*; but it is hardly to be expected that the press should join forces with the church in a systematic assumption that good government demands of citizens an heroic life. Such a mistake, however, the press is continually making. Whenever it becomes painfully apparent that government is not what it should be, the editorial method is either to charge the defect to the vices of the party of which the editor is not a member, or else to a lack of heroism in the community. For example, when it became evident to most intelligent people in New York, as it did several years ago, that their influence at the primary meetings and the polls was gone, they ceased to go to the primary meetings and the polls. They had found themselves outvoted by a more ignorant and more influential majority; it was a waste of time to take part in meetings composed of the most unfit electors, herded together for the purpose of selecting the most unfit candidates. For this natural conduct they were warmly rebuked by the press; they were told that it was their duty to go to the primaries, their duty to vote at the polls, their duty to allow themselves to be nominated for office. If the selection of candidates was bad, it was because good men refused to be candidates; if the polls were controlled by the ignorant, it was because the intelligent neglected their duties. These exhortations have produced, up to the present time, no effect. Every year the intelligent and honest classes take less and less interest in politics; every year the denunciations of their neglect grows more and more tremendous. How long our editorial zealots will continue their scathing diatribes remains to be seen. It never seems to have occurred to them that if frequent elections, extension of the suffrage, and the vast increase of popular offices have so changed the character of political life that acts which were originally, in a simpler state of society, prompted by the ordinary motives of self-interest, are prompted now only by the loftiest morality, the remedy lies, not in a quixotic attempt to sting the public conscience into an abnormal activity, but in such a change of system as shall give honesty and intelligence their due weight in political life. If they had been as thoughtful as they were patriotic, they might have read the lesson of the hour in the fate of one of the victims of their misguiding advice,—a gentleman who found by practical experience that the rewards of political knight-errantry in a modern American city were rather to be looked for in a speedy admission to the joys of a future life, than in any consciousness of having served his surviving fellow-citizens. Do these Catos of the press really imagine that they can induce any large numbers of their compatriots to enter the political arena on the terms which were granted Mr. Pullman? If what New

York needs is heroism, it will undoubtedly find its heroes, but it will find them in the tumult of a revolution.

In other instances also has the call upon heroism to furnish virtues for the support of the common weal signally failed. We do not recollect any more striking case than that of "absenteeism." American absentees, as we understand it, are of two classes, — those who, having taken a mean advantage of American institutions to accumulate a fortune, hasten to Europe to spend it; and those who, though living in one community, as, for example, Massachusetts or New York or Pennsylvania, wickedly employ their capital in other States, instigated thereto by the Devil and their own evil desires for a higher rate of interest. Who that is familiar with his daily paper does not remember the scathing rebukes administered at one time and another to these wicked men? People ought not to go to Europe to enjoy themselves; they ought to stay at home and go to their ward meetings and their district and county conventions. In the earlier and purer days of the Republic, it never was the custom for our best men and women to spend their summers on Swiss mountains and their winters in Italian galleries. The Declaration of Independence was not improvised in a gondola; the American Constitution was not conceived in the *coupé* of a diligence. Washington and Madison and Hamilton had other work to do than that of collecting pictures and hearing music. The true rejuvenating elixir of political life was the return of the travelling public from Europe to domestic duties.

And again, who does not remember the urgent appeals of the Boston press to the young men of Massachusetts to come forward and revive her decaying European commerce, and the denunciations of the men who were employing their capital in building profitable railroads in Nebraska, instead of maintaining unprofitable lines of steamships on the Atlantic? Heroism was found, as usual, unequal to the occasion. People were willing to die for their country, but no appeals to patriotism could induce them to undertake the task of bringing the products of the West to deep water for her. If the politicians of Massachusetts really suppose that capital will engage in unprofitable industries for the sake of patriotism, or that the well-being of a community can be fostered by such appeals, they furnish a very amusing instance of a very common delusion. But there is no need of accumulating instances. We have dwelt chiefly on the folly of the press, because the decay of the science of government elsewhere is generally taken for granted. That our legislatures and our executive officers are drawn from a very different class in society from that which used to supply them is not generally disputed; nor is it commonly supposed that our laws are well

made or well administered. But there exists a mysterious belief that in some unexplained manner, either through the press or the general virtue of the people, all these faults are corrected, so that the result is admirable, however singular the means. We do not believe that the result is admirable, or that the vices of a bad government can be cured in any way but by instituting a better one. The idea that we can rely on the press as a savior is for many reasons preposterous. The ultimate good to which we should direct all our efforts is political education, and our one object in calling attention to the Stygian darkness which prevails as to the true methods of political science is to attract the notice of the public, if possible, to the service done them by all serious writers on these subjects. The defects of Mr. Yeaman's book are neither few nor unimportant; but it is impossible not to sympathize with the aims of the author. Undoubtedly politics might be better taught by skilful teachers from other books, and the volume is not systematic or thorough enough to serve as a handbook. But it contains a good many valuable suggestions, and it is no small thing to know that there is at least one American writer on government who understands that the political art is a branch of science, and does not exclusively concern itself with the control of a majority of votes.

As we object to Mr. Yeaman's want of thoroughness, it is incumbent upon us to explain what we mean. The third chapter of his book is occupied with the discussion of "the object and province of government," and we could hardly select a topic which would be more likely to exhibit a political writer's strength or weakness. At the conclusion of the chapter we find the following sentences: "It results from the foregoing views that the only first foundation and the only safe guide for the science of politics is the purely moral science of ethics; the rights and duties of man as man; as a free, an equal, a moral, a responsible, a reasoning, an independent being, before the traditions and the artificial political contrivances based on force have made one man larger and another man smaller than the natural pattern of a man." This is either wholly unintelligible or wholly wrong. Ethics is the science of morality, and concerns the rights and duties of the individual. Politics concerns society at large, and a vast number of its most important questions have no more to do with ethics than with mathematics. What can ethics tell the world about the province of government, about sumptuary laws, about protective or prohibitory laws? A sumptuary law might treat man as "a free, an equal, a moral, a responsible, a reasoning and independent being," and ethics would be in vain called upon to furnish a guide for its adoption or rejection. Of course ethical questions become involved with those of politics; but how ethics can be

considered as the foundation and guide for politics we cannot understand. If Mr. Yeaman means that a man, to properly study political questions, ought to be endowed with a conscience, he is unquestionably right, and we strongly suspect that this is the only meaning which can be extracted from the sentence. As to the latter branch of it, what is the "natural pattern" of a man? Mr. Yeaman surely does not mean that the differences in the physical stature of mankind are solely due to their traditions and their artificial political contrivances. The book is full of such passages as this. For example, the first chapter, which deals with definitions of government and law, is very bad; it certainly ought never to have been written by a student of Austin. But, as we before said, we have no desire to rivet the attention of the reader upon Mr. Yeaman's deficiencies. His book shows an honest and intelligent mind. We trust that it may prove the herald of what its title signifies, for it is indeed time to return to the study of government. Little will it avail our descendants to know that their fathers extended liberty and vindicated the unity of their country, if at the same time they learn that these gains were made at the expense of their subjection to the tyrannous misrule of ignorance. If we would not present to the world the melancholy spectacle of a people too ingenious for government, too subtle for law, and too liberal for anything save anarchy, by all means let us return to the study of government. There are indications enough that we have neglected it. At the North, the capital of the country abandoned to corruption and intrigue, and our principal city under the control of a triumvirate of thieves; at the South, violence and rebellion stalking over the country; strange and foul customs establishing themselves under the flimsy pretence of religious sanction on our Western border; our Eastern coast one vast port of entry for hordes of ignorant barbarians, — is it not time that we should turn from our shameless pæan of exultation over the superiority of America to all other countries, and confess in humility that even Americans may have still something to learn?

4. — *United States Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel.*

By CLARENCE KING, Geologist in Charge.

Mining Industry, by JAMES D. HAGUE; with *Geological Contributions*, by CLARENCE KING. Submitted to the Chief of Engineers and published by Order of the Secretary of War under Authority of Congress. Illustrated by Thirty-seven Plates and accompanying Atlas. Washington: Government Printing Office. 4to. pp. 647. 1870.

THIS, as we are informed in a prefatory note, is the *third* volume in the series of the "Geological Exploration of the Fortieth Parallel,"